UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,502	09/28/2001	Robert L. Van Egmond	10559-470001	2556
²⁶²²⁵ FISH & RICH <i>A</i>	7590 05/28/200 ARDSON P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1022			CHUNG TRANS, XUONG MY	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/964,502	VAN EGMOND ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	XUONG M. CHUNG TRANS	2833	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 F This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the second	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and any objection to the Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the lead rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is objection.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documen 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documen 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati prity documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Art Unit: 2833

1. This is responsive to the amendment filed on 8/28/07.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ferracina (5,924,892).

As per claim 1, Ferracina discloses a network communication housing comprising: a main body 7; at least one connector 25 mounted onto a surface of the main body; and an easel 6 pivotally coupled to the main body 7.

As per claim 3, Ferracina discloses the easel further comprises at least one serrated edge 6b,6d for accepting a wire or cable.

As per claim 6, Ferracina discloses the easel 6 contains at least one hole 10 for excepting at least one wire or cable.

As per claim 9, Ferracina discloses the easel includes a first serrated edge located at a front side of the housing device and the main body includes a second serrated edge located at a backside of the housing device in which both the first and second serrated edges can accept at least one wire or cable.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferracina.

As per claims 4-5, Ferracina discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the at least one serrated edge is comprised of at least one semi-circular notch and/or "V-shaped" notch. Ferracina discloses a U- shaped notch 10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the easel of the Ferracina to have at least one semi-circular notch and/or "V-shaped" notch in stead of U-shaped notch, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the form/shapes of a component. A change in form/shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Dailey, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferracina, in view of Begley (4,979,634).

As per claim 7, Ferracina discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the easel further comprising a stop to prevent the easel from pivoting too far.

Begley, however, discloses the easel further comprising a stop 42 to prevent the easel from pivoting too far. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a stop as taught by Begley in the Ferracina easel in order to prevent the easel from over pivotal.

Claims 2, 8 and 10-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferracina, in view of Beecher, II et al. (6,291,767).

As per claim 2, Ferrancina discloses the invention substantially as claimed except at least one networking circuit located inside the main body that is coupled with the at least one connector and electromagnetic interference shielding (EMI) mounted onto the main body. Beecher, however, discloses at least one networking circuit located inside the main body that is coupled with the at least one connector and electromagnetic interference shielding (EMI) mounted onto the main body. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the teaching of Beecher in the Ferrancina connector housing in order to provide more flexible of use and to prevent (EMI).

As per claim 8, Ferrancina discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the main body has an edge that overlaps an edge of the easel. However, the use of overlap housing parts coupled to one another is well known in the art as evident by Beecher. Beecher disclose such overlap housing parts (12,14) coupled to one another. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Ferrancina connector housing to have overlaps an edge of the housing

coupled to one another as taught by Beecher in order to provide more securely couple the housing parts together.

As per claims 10-16, these claims recite a method corresponding to the network communication housing of claims 2-9; therefore, they are rejected under the similar rationale.

As per claims 17-26, these claims differ from claims 1-9 in that they further recite at least one foot for supporting the main body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ at least one foot for supporting the main body as needed and thereby stabilizing supporting the main body and/or prevent damage/scratch to the body.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beecher, II et al. (6,291,767) in view of Begley (4,979,634).

Beecher discloses a network communication housing comprising: a main body 10; at least one connector (102,107,108) mounted onto a surface of the main body; and an easel 12 coupled to the main body. Beecher does not explicitly disclose that the easel pivotally coupled to the main body. However, the use of the pivotally means (e.g. a hinge) are well known in the art as evidence by Begley. Begley discloses a hinge means 12, for use in hold-open the cover for circuit enclosure, boxes or the like. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the

Art Unit: 2833

Beecher housing to include a hinge as taught by Begley in order to allow the easel/cover and the body pivotally coupled together.

As per claims 2-4 and 6, Beecher discloses at least one networking circuit located inside the main body that is coupled with the at least one connector and electromagnetic interference shielding (EMI) mounted onto the main body; the easel 12 further comprises at least one serrated edge 66 for accepting a wire or cable; the serrated edge is semi-circular notch 66, the easel 12 contains at least one hole 66 for accepting at least one wire or cable.

As per claim 5, Beecher discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the at least one serrated edge is comprised of at least one "V-shaped" notch.

Beecher discloses such semi-circular notch. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the easel of the Beecher to have at least one "V-shaped" notch in stead of semi-circular notch, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shapes of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Dailey, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976).

As per claim 7, Begley discloses that the easel further comprises: a stop 42 to prevent the easel from pivoting too far.

As per claim 8, Beecher discloses the invention substantially as claimed except that the main body has an edge that overlaps an edge of the easel. Beecher, however, does disclose that an edge of the easel overlaps an edge of the body. Therefore, it would have been obvious to have an edge of the body overlaps an edge of the easel

instead of the edge of the easel overlaps an edge of the body, since the court has held that rearranging parts/reversal of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70. In re Einstein, 8 USPQ 167.

As per claim 9, it would have been obvious that a second serrated edge can also be located at a backside of the housing device in which both the first and second serrated edges can accept at least one wire or cable.

As per claims 10-16, these claims recite a method corresponding to the network communication housing of claims 1-9; therefore, they are rejected under the similar rationale.

As per claims 17-26, these claims differ from claims 1-9 in that they further recite at least one foot for supporting the main body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ at least one foot for supporting the main body as needed and thereby stabilizing supporting the main body and/or prevent damage/scratch to the body.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xuong M. Chung-Trans whose telephone number is (571) 272-2002. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

Application/Control Number: 09/964,502 Page 8

Art Unit: 2833

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on (571) 272-2800 extension 33.. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Xuong M. Chung-Trans/

Examiner, Art Unit 2833